THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

SPRING, 1944. **[WARTIME EDITION. 6d.]** **Vol. 15. No. 57**

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: List obtainable from the Hon. Secretary.
America: The Revd. F. F. E. BLAKE, 1625 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME.

At the Annual Meeting in 1943 the Emergency Committee passed a resolution asking Dr. Moss to prepare a Statement which would make clear the Society's attitude to the South India Scheme. This Dr. Moss consented to do, and after being sent to members of the General Committee for comment, the Statement was finally approved in the following form:

WE the undersigned, members of the Committee of the Anglican Society declare our belief that the scheme now proposed for the union of the Anglican Dioceses in South India with the Methodist and South Indian United Churches will, if carried out, be disastrous to the Anglican Communion, the cause of Christian Unity, and the evangelization of India, for the following reasons:—

(1) The scheme is based not on real agreement, but on the use of words in different senses by different parties.

(2) It is not accepted unanimously by either side, but on the contrary has roused such strong opposition among all three parties to it that it seems certain to bring about fresh schisms.

(3) Whereas the Anglican province of India, Burma and Ceylon is a province of the ancient Catholic Church, by the faith and order of which it is bound, the other parties to the scheme are not, and do not claim to be, churches in this sense, subject to these obligations: but the scheme wholly ignores this fundamental difference.

(4) The Anglican Churches, with the rest of the Catholic Church, teach that the Church is the final judge in disputes about the interpretation of Scripture (Art. 20): but the scheme appears to ignore this fundamental principle.

(5) The scheme appears to leave individual members of the proposed church free to deny any article of the Creed, and to interpret the Creed in any way they please.

(6) Baptism, though prescribed as a rule of order, is not declared to be generally necessary to salvation, or to be the sacrament of the New Birth (St. John 3, 5), and there is nothing to prevent an unbaptised European missionary from becoming a minister, or even a bishop, in the proposed church.

(7) Confirmation, though declared by Heb. 6, 2, and by every part of the Catholic Church to be a foundation of the Christian religion, is in the scheme reduced to an optional alternative to the Methodist 'recognition service.'

(8) The Eucharistic doctrine of the proposed church is inadequate (and the Swedish Church in South India has rejected the scheme for this reason): for the scheme nowhere suggests that Holy Communion is generally necessary to salvation or that it

is the means whereby we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, or that it is in any sense an offering to God; which doctrines are clearly taught by the Anglican Churches and the whole Catholic Church, on the authority of the New Testament.

(9) The provision for the ministry is an attempt to combine two incompatible doctrines of ministerial authority, and does not secure that the bishops and presbyters in the proposed church will be what the Catholic Church means by bishops and priests, since the sacerdotal duties peculiar to them, together with the very word 'priest,' are nowhere mentioned in the scheme.

(10) The bishops in the proposed church will not have the decisive voice in matters of faith: and it is not certain that even this modified form of episcopacy will be permanent, since the proposed church is to be precluded from holding any doctrine of the nature or authority of episcopacy.

(11) The relations between the proposed church and the Anglican Communion (of which it is not to be a part), as well as with other communions, are left vague; and no provision is made for Anglican Churchmen in South India who may feel unable to join the new church, and who must either cause a fresh division or be left without the sacraments.

(12) The proposed scheme is likely to hinder closer relations between the Anglican Communion and the Eastern and Scandinavian Churches both in South India and elsewhere, and to endanger our union with the Old Catholics.

We recognise the urgency of the need of Christian unity in South India, as well as the devotion and labours over many years of those who have prepared this scheme, but we are convinced that nothing short of orthodox Catholic Faith and Order is capable of resisting the absorbent power of Hinduism, or of converting the peoples of India. It is, therefore, with the deepest reluctance and regret that we feel bound to oppose the scheme, at the same time urging the continuance of efforts to find a basis of unity which shall exhibit a real measure of theological agreement between the parties concerned.

H. Adeane Byard, *President.*
C. B. Moss, *Literary Secretary.*
G. B. Timms, *General Secretary.*
A. W. Blanchett.
R. F. Borough.
J. E. Bowles.
W. E. Norris.
Jocelyn Perkins.
W. H. Walter Williams.
E. G. P. Wyatt.

THE REVISED MARRIAGE SERVICE OF 1928.

The use of the Occasional Offices, especially those for Baptism, Marriage, and Burial of the Dead, in the Prayer-Book of 1928, is very widely spread, and is found in many parishes where the rest of the book is ignored. Doubts have been raised whether we can truly say that a marriage celebrated with this rite is "in accordance with the rites of the Church of England." This is a legal question which I am not competent to answer, but so far as I know, the use of this rite has never been challenged, and since it has even been used by Royalty, we may assume that the civil lawyers have no objection. Its ecclesiastical authority is the same as that of the rest of the 1928 Prayer-Book, the sanction given by the four houses of Convocation in 1929.

The differences between the revised and the unrevised rite may be classified thus:

(1) Differences in the introductory address.

(2) Alteration of words which are no longer intelligible.

(3) Removal of the bride's promise to "obey."

(4) Substitution of "Priest" for "Minister" throughout.

(5) Addition of a second alternative psalm: followed by "Let us pray."

(6) Removal of references to the example of Hebrew patriarchs, and to the story of Adam's rib.

(7) Removal of redundancy from the closing prayers.

(8) Provision for a Nuptial Mass: and of a final prayer and blessing when there is no Nuptial Mass.

All these changes, except (3), are certainly improvements.

(1) Changes in the introductory address are not, strictly speaking, changes in the rite.

It seems to most of us brutal to tell a Christian bridegroom and bride, on their

wedding day, not to behave " like brute beasts that have no understanding ;" and the suggestion that marriage is a second-best course for such as " have not the gift of continency," though certainly in accordance with mediaeval ideas, is difficult to justify by Holy Scripture. We no longer believe that Heb. xiii, 4, " marriage is honourable in all," was written by St. Paul, whose name is therefore omitted. Otherwise the teaching of the old introduction is given in a more suitable form in the new.

(2) All parish priests know how difficult such words as " ordinance " (commonly pronounced " audience " !), " worship," and " procreation " are for their less educated parishioners. The translation of such words into modern equivalents is only common sense : indeed, the revisers might have gone further in this direction.

(3) The omission of " obey " from the bride's vow is a much more disputable matter. Though it does not appear in the modern Roman marriage rite, Wickham Legg showed that it was invariably found in all the older rites of Christendom ; and it is unquestionably scriptural. Its omission appears to be due to feminist influence, which is stronger among the episcopate than among the lower clergy or the laity (as successive Lambeth Conferences show). The New Testament clearly teaches that the sexes are equal (Gal. iii 28, I. Cor. xi. 11), that government belongs to the man (Eph. v. 22, etc.), but that government is not the mark of dignity (St. Mark x. 43). Our Lady is unquestionably the first of saints, but she did not share the government given to the Apostles only. The suggestion often heard, that St. Paul's authority may be ignored, is contrary to the fundamental principle that the New Testament as a whole is decisive.

(4) " Minister " in the 1662 Prayer-Book is equivalent to " priest " : but because some ignorant incumbents require their deacons to take marriages, it was necessary to make clear that the officiant must be in priest's orders, since he must bless.

(5) The provision of an extra psalm is unnecessary, but harmless ; of " Let us pray " brings the service into line with liturgical precedents.

(6) Many who come to be married nowadays, I fear, know nothing of Abraham and Sarah, or Isaac and Rebekah ; nor can we now regard the Hebrew patriarchs as either certainly historical, or models for Christian husbands (Gen. xvi. 3, xxv. 28). The reference to Isaac and Rebekah was originally to " Thobie and Sara " (1549) ; but those who are ignorant of Genesis are even less likely to know the Book of Tobit ! Nor can we take seriously the story of Adam's rib !

(7) Nobody could read the closing prayers in the two rites without seeing how clumsy the long prayer in the old rite is, and how superior the new one is : though we may regret the absence of " Who by Thy mighty power hast made all things of nothing," and the absence of " obedient " spoils the rhythm.

(8) The provision for a Nuptial Mass (as in 1549) is an obvious and much-needed improvement.

I recommend, therefore, the use of the 1928 rite wherever possible, except the omission of " obey " in the bride's vow (and of " and obedient " in the final prayer). This change is so contrary to Scripture and to the tradition of the Church, and appears in so essential a part of the rite, that it should not be made as part of a scheme of permissive variations. This is precisely the advice given by so learned a supporter of the 1928 Prayer Book as the Bishop of Gloucester. We may be profoundly thankful that the witness of the Marriage Service to the absolute indissolubility of marriage is in no way weakened by the 1928 revision.

C. B. Moss.

FORGIVENESS.

Often as I have meditated—and preached—upon the First Word from the Cross, only quite recently did it occur to me to ponder what is really a very obvious and significant fact, viz. that our Blessed Lord did not say, " *I* forgive." Only if we have fully grasped the true nature and essential conditions of forgiveness shall we understand why.

Take the case of a small boy caught in some misdemeanour who at once cries out, " Please forgive me, Daddy !" What he really means is, " Please don't punish me !" But another boy, in similar circumstances, takes his punishment like a man, and then says, " Please forgive me !" This boy understands the meaning of the word. For forgiveness is not tantamount to remission

of penalties, though it may include this. The boy has done something wrong, and this causes a rupture in the happy relationship between himself and his father; he feels uncomfortable; there is a sense of estrangement; a barrier has arisen between them. Forgiveness implies the breaking down of that barrier and the resumption of the former sense of perfect trust and confidence between parent and child.

Now our Lord makes it abundantly clear that repentance is a sine-qua-non for forgiveness. St. Peter's question and his Master's reply (". . . . until seventy times seven"—Mt. xviii, 21 *f.*) are sometimes quoted as though they imply unconditional forgiveness. But elsewhere—in the very same chapter indeed—our Lord shows plainly that He meant nothing of the kind. "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." (Mt. xviii, 15*ff.*)* Two facts emerge:—(1) The Christian must not be content to adopt a merely passive attitude; he is not to wait for the offender to come pleading for pardon. In order to show not only his willingness but his earnest desire to forgive, he is to take active measures to bring about a sense of compunction in the other, and to elicit from him an expression of apology and regret. But (2) The erring brother is not to be forgiven unless and until he acknowledges his fault and shows himself penitent. So, too, in Luke xvii, 3 *f.*—"If thy brother sin, rebuke him; and *if he repent*, forgive him. And if he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again unto thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."

When our Lord sent forth the Seventy upon their missionary tour He said: "Into whatsoever city ye shall enter, and they receive you not, go out into the streets thereof and say, Even the dust from your city, that cleaveth to our feet, we do wipe off against you . . . I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable in that day for Sodom than for that city." (Luke x, 10*ff.* *Cf.* His instructions to the Twelve, Mt. x, 14*f.*, Mk. vi, 11; and see Acts xiii, 51.) Rejection of His message was not to be accorded a cheap and easy "forgiveness," for this would mean nothing to impenitent people who did not even ask for it.

And what of our Lord's own personal example regarding forgiveness? Children who are brought up on "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild" are liable to form a very one-sided impression of His character, which was in no way weak or effeminate, but essentially virile. There was nothing maudlin or even facile about Him. He was every inch the Man. Gentle indeed He was—at the right time: none was ever more tender towards the heartbroken mourner or the penitent sinner. Meek and mild—yes, in so far as His own personal sufferings were concerned: then of a truth He was "as a lamb that is led to the slaughter; and as a sheep that before her shearers is dumb." But on the other hand, none was ever more terrible in his fiery wrath than He. If any have been brought up to think of the Son of Man as easy-going and indulgent, let them recall some of His scorching words of condemnation, sentences of doom uttered publicly in the streets and market places.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" (repeated again and again—Mt. xxiii, 13 *f.*, Lk. xi, 42 *f.*)

"Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell? Therefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: some of them shall ye kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth . . . Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation." (Mt. xxiii, 33 *f.*)

"Whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on Me to stumble, it is profitable for him that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea. Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling! for it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!" (Mt. xviii, 6 *f.*, Mk. ix 42, Lk xvii, 1 *f.*)

"Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness: there shall be

* Some scholars have doubted the authenticity of vv. 16, 17; but in any case v. 15 suffices to show that forgiveness is not to be unconditional.

the weeping and gnashing of teeth." (Mt. viii 11 *f.*, Lk. xiii 24—30.)

"Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. Howbeit I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven? thou shalt go down unto hades: for if the mighty works had been done in Sodom which were done in thee, it would have remained until this day. Howbeit I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee." (Mt. xi 20 *ff.*, Lk. x 13 *ff.*)

I have quoted these passages—by no means the only ones to the same effect*—for they are essential to my main point. In not one of them is there any hint of forgiveness. Why? Because in each case repentance was lacking, and without repentance forgiveness is impossible. We can now understand why upon Calvary's hill our Lord did not say, "I forgive." True, He prayed His Father in Heaven to forgive, but this is hardly the same thing. In view of His insistence upon the essential need of repentance, we must surely understand that sublime utterance as a prayer that God would turn the hearts of those who had nailed Him to the Cross, and even more—for His actual executioners were merely obeying orders—the hearts of the guilty Jewish officials who had compassed His death by their lying accusations. If tradition is to be believed—and tradition sometimes tells the truth—the centurion at least became a converted man. Moreover, we are definitely told that in days to come "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." (Acts vi 7.)

What, then, is the precise lesson that we are to learn from the First Word from the Cross? Surely this, that our Lord was longing from His heart to forgive His murderers, but that for the time being He could not do so. For it takes two to effect forgiveness and to break down the barrier erected by sin. The guilty party must first repent; not till then is forgiveness even possible.† If, then, someone has done a grievous wrong to one professing the faith of Christ Crucified, the latter must be willing and ready to forgive, longing indeed to be able to forgive; he must pray from his heart that the other will acknowledge and express contrition for his wrongdoing; he must obey our Lord's injunction, "Go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone." Then, "if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother."

With regard to the words, "as we forgive them that trespass against us": in view of Christ's insistence upon the necessity of repentance (whether between man and God, or between man and man), we must obviously understand them as implying our readiness and longing to forgive our neighbour, and our determination to do so the moment that he acknowledges his fault. Also, of course the fact that we have already done so whenever he has shown genuine contrition.

* * *

No essay on Forgiveness would be complete without reference to the parable of the Prodigal Son. The young man was evidently a "modern"; he regarded his father as a "back number"; he kicked against parental restraint and chafed at parental rebukes. Finally he made up his mind to leave home altogether. It is noticeable that the father makes no attempt to hold him back; on the contrary, he even hands over to him the share of the estate that normally he would have received at the father's death. God has given us free-will, and therefore He does not use methods of coercion. Like the prodigal son we are entirely free to turn our backs upon Him and to go our own way.

The second act of the drama tells us how the young man squandered his inheritance in riotous living, and was subsequently obliged to herd swine—a peculiarly obnoxious employment for a Jew, to whom, of course, pigs were "unclean" animals. Owing to a "mighty famine" in the land he was now in desperate straits. Sin had brought about its own punishment. He resolved to throw himself upon his father's mercy. Once again we see that there was no coercion: the return was entirely voluntary. God never compels us to come to Him, but draws us "with bands of love" (Hos. xi, 4).

* Some of our Lord's parables, for instance, illustrate the same teaching, viz. that without repentance there is no forgiveness; e.g. the Tares, the Dragnet, the Wedding-garment, the Talents, the Wicked Husbandmen, etc.

† The Apostles certainly understood their Master's teaching in this sense. See, for example, Acts ii, 38, iii, 19, v. 31, viii, 22, etc.

The parable has often been criticized on the ground that it was merely the prospect of starvation that caused the youth's "conversion"; that his "repentance", being based upon the hope of obtaining food and drink, cannot be regarded as the genuine article. But we must beware of pressing every little particular of our Lord's parables. In each He aims at imparting some great moral lesson; and minor details, relevant enough to the "earthly story" as such, may have no application whatever to the "heavenly meaning." Moreover, the young man had at least learned a lesson of real humility. Not only did he resolve to return and make confession to his father; not only would he acknowledge his unworthiness to be called his son; but he would beg him to receive him back as a mere hired servant.

The third act tells us of the prodigal's return, and of his welcome home. The father had never lost hope; daily he had been on the look-out; he was longing to forgive, and doubtless the son's return was in answer to his earnest prayers that the youth might be led to see the error of his ways and come back. And at last one day he caught sight of his son, ragged and foot-sore, so different from the debonair and supercilious young man who had left home many months before. He did not wait, but ran to meet him "while he was yet afar off." So too is the Heavenly Father ever watching for the return of His prodigal children. They must come back to Him of their own accord and desire; but, if only they will do so, He will meet them half-way, and "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God."

And so, ere the young man has time to ask that he may be taken back as a servant, the father accords him full and free forgiveness; bygones are bygones; and the old happy relationship that had once existed between father and child before the latter began to grow "restless" is re-established.

The fourth act introduces the elder brother, who now plays a prominent and unpleasant part, haughtily refusing to join in the generous welcome that is being accorded to the erring younger son. To the casual reader this incident may appear quite irrelevant to the main theme, which is that repentance and confession lead to full and free forgiveness. The parable, he may feel, would have ended far more fittingly with the father's joy in his son's change of heart and the complete reconciliation between them. The "elder brother incident" seems to jar, and to spoil the perfect beauty of the story. But our Lord added it with a very definite purpose. As will be seen by a careful reading of the chapter (Luke xv), the parable was told, partly at least by way of rebuke to the haughty Pharisees and scribes who found fault with Him—not for the first time—for consorting with "publicans and sinners" (vv. 1, 2). He, however, had come to call, not the self-righteous, but those who acknowledged themselves to be sinners. The elder brother, who resents his father's wholehearted forgiveness of, and welcome to, the erring prodigal, typifies these same self-righteous Pharisees and scribes who objected to our Lord's loving tenderness towards those whom they deemed "outsiders." As He had ironically remarked upon another occasion, "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick." (Mt. ix, 12, Mk. ii, 17, Lk. v, 31). Thus, even in this final incident our Lord is still teaching the paramount necessity of repentance as a condition of forgiveness. Those who deem themselves spiritually and morally "whole" are in effect self-excommunicate; they are (so long as they persist in their self-righteous demeanour) outside the pale of salvation; by denying their own need of repentance, confession, and amendment of life, they make forgiveness impossible. As St. John in years to come expressed it in words so familiar to every churchman, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (I Jn. i, 8 *f.*) G. F. POLLARD.

[This article was sent in for publication over a year ago.—EDITOR.]

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

It remains to be seen how far the Liturgical Movement in the Latin Church will permeate Roman Catholic theology. In the meantime the Tridentine statement remains as the official teaching of Rome in regard to the Eucharist.

The antithesis between Rome and Protestantism in regard to sacrifice turns

upon the thought of a repetition of the immolation of the Cross. But it is important to emphasize what we have already pointed out, viz. that Latin and Evangelical Christianity are agreed in limiting sacrifice to the Death of Christ.

Tridentine and mediaeval doctrine on the one side contends that although Christ's Death upon the Cross is the complete sacrifice yet, in the sacrifice of the mass, Christ Crucified is made available under the species of Bread and Wine, and is offered by the priest ; the difference between Calvary and the Eucharist being a difference in the *mode* of offering but not in sacrifice. This subtilty of language will not do however ; for if the mode of offering is different then it is not the same sacrifice. But somehow or in some manner is a repetition of the Death of Christ.

On the other hand what is commonly called Evangelical Christianity, asserts that, the Death of Christ upon the Cross is the one and all-sufficient sacrifice, never to be repeated in any way or in any form. With the assertion that, the Death of our Lord is all-sufficient we are in complete agreement. But we may very properly ask, how does the merit of our Lord's Death and Passion become available for us to-day ? The Death of the Lord happened within the realms of time, it is an event of past history. How may those who come after him in time be partakers of the redeeming power and work of his Cross ? It is just here that the doctrine of the Ascended Christ comes in to the picture. For through the power of the Holy Spirit there is made available for us to-day the merits of the earthly work of our Lord. In the Heavenlies our Lord offers no new sacrifice ; but rather he has borne into the realms of eternity his Death and Passion and all that it implies. Christ is to-day a priest after the order of Melchizedek (Heb. vii, 11—viii, 2) his priesthood is eternal. The Christ whom the church worships to-day is not merely the human figure who trod the shores of the Sea of Galilee, nor the pathetic and dead figure that hung lifeless upon the Tree of Calvary. Good Friday for us can never be the same as it was to the disciples. It is not the end, but rather the beginning of the New Life. The Cross speaks not only of life given to death; but also through death the New and triumphant life. Almost all the ancient liturgies insist that the sacrifice of Our Lord is found in his Passion, Death, Resurrection and Ascension.

A good deal of popular Anglo-Catholic teaching to-day is borrowed from the ideas of the Council of Trent ; and this is particularly noticeable in the thoughts of Christ's priesthood and the clergy as priests of the Church. Popular manuals of theology following the Tridentine ideas, seem to assert that Christ only exercises his Eternal priesthood through the priesthood of his church on earth in the sacrifice of the mass. Such an idea exalts the individual priest above the Church and makes the Church dependant upon the individual priest. Besides, this idea is derogatory to the Church as the Bride and the Mystical Body of Christ. It is also derogatory to our Great High Priest. The priesthood of the clergy is a ministerial priesthood which they exercise on behalf of the church of which they are members and by whom they receive their authority and commission. When the priests of the church pray the liturgy they pray, not instead of the church or apart from the church, but as the ministers of that church. It is most significant that the Tridentine teaching about the priesthood of the church ignores the whole conception of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ which offers herself in the Eucharist in union with the heavenly oblation of our true High Priest.

The theory of transubstantiation has so dominated Western eucharistic doctrine since the thirteenth century that, the whole idea of the Eucharist has been narrowed down to an argument as to the mode of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament.

The recovery of the wider aspects of eucharistic faith and practice will not be achieved immediately. But perhaps the best means of assisting that recovery is to insist that proper emphasis be given to the idea of the Church as the " Corpus Christi Mysticum " being offered in the Eucharist. We are dealing with a sacred mystery, but we are justified in speaking of the intimate connection which exists in the Holy Eucharist between our Lord as the " Corpus Christi " on the one hand, and His Church also as the Body of Christ. Both aspects of this mystery need to be kept before us in doctrine and worship.

The Sacrifice of the Church on earth has no meaning apart from the Eternal offering of our Lord in the Heavenlies. In heaven Christ accepts the offering of his Church and unites it with his own unique Priesthood. The Head of the Church offers the sacrifice of the Church through his own Eternal offering and not vice versa.

There are two different offerings implied in the Eucharist which, united in one become the offering and sacrifice of Christ and His Mystical Body—the Church. For while the Lord directly offers His Body and Blood to be the true Bread and Wine of his Eternal Priesthood ; and to be the Bread and Wine of Life to his Church, we must say that the Church on earth is only admitted to share in this offering of Christ's Body and Blood by virtue of her own obedient offering of that earthly bread and wine which represents them. This difference in the mode of offering is just the difference between Christ and his Church.

The bread and wine offered in the Eucharist are in the first instance offered as an act of obedient thanksgiving for God's work of atonement and redemption, made known to us in the Incarnation, Passion, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ. In that act of offering too, there is the lifting up to God the Father of all human prayer through the Eternal Intercession of the Glorified Christ. The Eucharist is thus the supreme example of all Christian prayer: '*through Jesus Christ our Lord.*'

In the traditional liturgies of the Church all mention of sacrifice concludes with the anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer. The giving back of the gifts as Christ's Body and Blood was the evidence that the Church's offering had been accepted and united with the Eternal Sacrifice.

Much ink has been spilt in recent times on the question of the Epiclesis or Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic Prayer. The true meaning of the Invocation is surely, not for the new production of the Body and Blood of Christ ; but rather for the union of things heavenly and earthly. For the joining of the Church's offering with the Eternal offering of her divine Lord and Head. We may say that through the power of the Holy Ghost there is a transfusion of spiritual power to the earthly offering, so that the latter becomes the vehicle of the Presence and the communication of the Heavenly. In the Holy Eucharist there is made available for us the ' Real ' Presence of the Eternal offering of our Lord, who is for his Church both Priest and Victim.

The Church's offering is her participation with Christ in his heavenly act of offering. But the full consecration of the bread and wine does not just consist in their becoming the means of the Church's participation in Christ's Eternal offering. For the Bread and Wine also become the means whereby the true Communion of the Eternal Sacrifice is made available to those who have been made members of Christ in Baptism and Confirmation. The reception of Holy Communion is the sacramental guarantee that we, who are members of Christ's Mystical Body, are further strengthened and engrafted into the Corpus Christi Mysticum.

As St. Augustine truly says: ' If then you wish to understand the Body of Christ, hear what the Apostle says to believers: " Now you are the Body of Christ and members thereof," your divine mystery is set on the Table of the Lord: you receive your mystery.'

The mediaeval and Tridentine doctrines of transubstantiation and the Real Presence seem to come perilously near separating the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity from the Father and the Holy Spirit. The Worship of Christ in the Liturgy or in any so-called extra liturgical devotions must be with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Certain types of eucharistic piety are what the late Bishop Gore has characterized as ' Jesus worship.'

Christian prayer is essentially Trinitarian ; and the Eucharistic anaphora has grown up in conformity with this conception. The traditional Eucharistic Prayer is addressed to God the Father, it commemorates with thanksgiving the work of the Son, and prays for the blessing of the Holy Spirit upon the action. The underlying idea of eucharistic worship is also to be found expressed in most of the ancient liturgies (including the Latin Canon of the Mass) viz., The union of the Church on earth with the worship of heaven. The worship of heaven is the worship of God in his Triune Majesty. For the Church on earth such worship is made through Jesus Christ the heavenly High Priest of the Christian Profession. Being our High Priest he is also the mediator of the New Covenant between God and man (Heb. x 19—25 ; xii 22—29). Eucharistic worship is thus the worship of the Father in Spirit and in truth through the Only-Begotten Son, Who by the Eternal sprinkling of his Sacrificial Blood purifies our consciences to enable us thus acceptably to serve the living God in one Holy fellowship of Divine Love.

(*Concluded*).

BOOKS REVIEWED.

THE PRAYER-BOOK OF 1928 RECONSIDERED
W. K. Lowther Clarke. [S.P.C.K.]

This is an interesting book, but it is rather difficult to understand the purpose of its production at this particular time. If there existed any intention of undertaking a fresh revision of the Prayer-book now or in the near future, many of the criticisms which it contains would be very useful. But it is hard to believe that there is any such serious intention. It seems likely that the practical effect of the book will be to store up the fanatical opposition to the Revised Prayer-book, which exists in some quarters.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH: An introduction to Dogmatic Theology, by C. B. Moss, D.D. [S.P.C.K., 16/-.]

The instinctive reaction of most Englishmen to dogmatics (whether political, theological or of any other kind) is unfavourable. A cut and dried cocksureness is immediately suspect; no man, or group of men, has a monopoly of the truth; a high degree of probability is the most that dare be asserted of any opinion. The present reviewer is sufficiently a typical Englishman to have felt, upon first glancing through Dr. Moss's book, a suspicious distaste for its contents. The Preface, however, comforted him a little when he read "Readers are warned . . . to take no statement for granted, but to check it for themselves. No belief is really ours until we have made it our own." The admonition had a reassuring sound about it; so he settled down to digest the main body of the work. His final judgment is, that this is a really valuable book which every priest and theological student, and as many laymen as possible, should possess.

It is a systematic exposition of the whole of dogmatic theology, ordered and arranged on a broadly historical framework, while at the same time following the dogmatic sequence of thought of the Apostles' Creed. The clarity of the arrangement, into seventy-six chapters with divisions and sub-divisions, and the excellence of the printer's lay-out, enhance its value.

That the author possesses an orderly and logical mind is apparent on every page, while the terseness of his writing enables him to pack an amazing amount of thought into a very small compass. For instance, he manages to dismiss both British Israelitism and Papalism, almost in parenthesis, during a chapter on the Ascension, but without giving the impression of mere pamphleteering. Again, the chapter on the Virgin Birth of Our Lord, seven pages long, forms a short essay which is a masterpiece of exposition, marshalling very fairly the evidence for and against, and concluding with a valuable paragraph showing the necessity for such belief from the standpoint of Anglican order. But terseness of style does not, with Dr. Moss, make for dulness, for the writing is exceptionally lively, while his *obiter dicta* give a delightful piquancy to the book, *e.g.* "No Anglican can be a good Catholic, who is not a good Anglican."

The author is an unrepentant Anglican, and the book is, as he states in the Preface, intended chiefly for members of the Anglican churches. It so happened that the reviewer, immediately before reading this book, had been reading Dr. Cross's *Life of Darwell Stone*, and was struck both by the similarity and difference of standpoint between Dr. Moss and Dr. Stone. Both are at one in appealing to the witness of the Catholic Church at large, but while Dr. Stone appears to have "minimised what was specifically Anglican," Dr. Moss finds in the specifically Anglican presentation of the common Catholic faith and order something intrinsically valuable. The book should therefore, in the words of a reviewer in the *Church Times*, "do much good . . . in correcting the apologetic tone that is too common when Anglicans meet Christians of other communions."

A most useful part of the book is that in which Dr. Moss summarises the teaching of the Churches of Eastern Christendom and of Continental Protestantism, with both of which most Anglicans are woefully unfamiliar. His clear exposition also of the meaning and the theological basis of Catholic order should prove of great value in discussions about re-union.

Few, of course, will find themselves in full agreement with every statement in the book. The reviewer, for instance, feels that Dr. Moss has done less than justice to the Kenotic theory in his chapter on the Manhood of Christ. One would not suppose from Dr. Moss's treatment of the theory that it had had as respectable an exponent

as the late Dr. Gore, nor do Dr. Moss's reasons for rejecting it appear to the present writer logically convincing. But the work as a whole can be most heartily recommended as likely to prove, in the words of the Publishers, "invaluable not only to students, but as a reference book for those already ordained."

G. B. TIMMS.

OUR BOUNDEN DUTY, by Leonard Spiller. [Mowbray.]

A book, with the same title as the above, has been published by S.P.C.K. For the information of our members, it is pointed out that the S.P.C.K. publication is *not the same* as Mowbray's which was written by Mr. Spiller at the request of members of the committee of the Alcuin Club, for the use of children at the Holy Eucharist in Churches which follow the English Use.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PLAINSONG "ORDINARY OF THE MASS."

SIR,—It was good to read of the singing of the Plainsong "Ordinary" at the School of Worship at Pleshey. The setting of the Creed to this traditional music has, as your correspondent says, been common to Western Christendom since the sixth century, though I believe that it was not introduced on any scale into England before the tenth century.

During Dr. Gore's Episcopate a Plainsong Choir of Clergy was formed in Birmingham under the direction of the Hon. James Adderley and Mr. S. Royle Shore, who was Director of Church Music at the Pro-Cathedral. They gave useful help at Dedication and Patronal Festivals and other special occasions on weekdays, and thus the Plainsong Ordinary was made familiar to a considerable number of parishes. This example might well be followed in many large centres if a suitable leader could be found.

Some years ago it fell to my lot to minister to a group of Ovambo Christians who were working in the S.W. African Diamond Fields, and they used to bring with them some Romanist friends. It was less than five years since the Mission among them had been started, but part of the Prayer Book and a number of hymns had been translated into Osikuanjama by the Rev. G. H. Bridges, a kinsman of the late Poet-Laureate, and they sang this ancient music with ease and devotion. Few things have brought home to me more vividly the continuity and universality of our Church than the joining with these recent African converts from heathenism in singing the Mass in their own tongue to "the music which Augustine and Becket and Stephen Langton sang."

August 23rd, 1943. J. E. BOWLES.

THE BENEDICTUS QUI VENIT.

SIR,—While I heartily agree that *Benedictus qui venit* should not be appended to the *Sanctus*, F.F.E.B. is not correct in stating that the prayer following in all ancient liturgies never mentions it. For in many of the Masses of the ancient "Gallican" liturgies, the connecting link is "vene sanctus, vene benedictus Dominus." and sometimes "vene benedictus" without "vene sanctus." One *Post Sanctus* prayer is "Sanctus in sanctis, benedictus in terris, Dominus noster Jesus Christus."

Feb. 9, 1944. E. G. P. WYATT.

Printed and published by A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, St. Clement's Street. Oxford.